

Application No. 09/677,711  
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006

### REMARKS

Presently, claims 3, 15, 19, 20, 31-33, and 35-53 are pending in the application. A Request for Continued Examination ("RCE") under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 is being filed herewith. Independent claims 3, 15 and 31 have been amended and new independent claim 45 has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 3, 15, and 31 and the features of new claim 45 may be found, for example, at page 7, line 27 through page 8, line 2, at page 14, lines 29-32 and at page 15, line 24 through page 16, line 1 of the specification. Dependent claims 19 and 20 have been amended to be consistent with claim 15, as amended. New dependent claims 37-41, 42-43, 44 and 46-53 have been added to depend from independent claims 3, 15, 31 and 45, respectively. Support for the features of new dependent claims 37-41, 42-43, 44 and 46-53 may be found, for example, in claims 3, 15, 31 and 45, and at page 7, line 27-32, line 2, at page 14, lines 29-32, at page 15, lines 11, 12 and 19, at the table on page 15, and at page 15, line 24 through page 16, line 1 of the specification. Accordingly, no new matter has been added to the application by the foregoing amendments.

Descriptions of the prior art reference discussed herein may be found in Applicant's previous Amendments filed in this application on October 27, 2005 and March 17, 2006, which are incorporated herein by reference.

### *Examiner Interview*

Applicant and the undersigned thank Examiner Paul H. Kang for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview conducted on June 5, 2006 to discuss the present application and Office Action. During the interview, the Examiner's reading of the prior art and its applicability to the claims of the present application were discussed. Potential amendments to the claims were also discussed. The Examiner reserved the right to fully consider such amendments upon submission of a formal response.

Application No. 09/677,711  
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006

***Prior Art Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,811 to Angles et al. ("Angles").

**Angles Does Not Customize a Web Page Based on Anonymous Demographic Data**

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner argues that Angles' consumer member code is "viewed as demographic information" (page 4) and that Angles' system protects the anonymity of the user by using the consumer member code to reference demographic data stored on a registration database. However, and properly so, the Examiner does not contend that the stored demographic data in Angles preserves the anonymity of the user. In fact, during the interview on June 5, 2006, the Examiner agreed that the stored demographic data in Angles does indeed contain non-anonymous data; examples of such non-anonymous data in Angles are the "consumer's digital cash account" (column 16, line 39) and "other account information" (column 17, lines 8-9).

The Examiner further argues that the user computer in Angles' system contains demographic information which is used to customize a web page by, stating in the Advisory Action that "the information in the cookie is utilized to customize at least one web page request by the user" (page 5); this argument relies on the Examiner's contention, as noted above, that Angles' consumer member code is actually demographic information.

In summary, the Examiner's argument in support of his rejection relies on the following premises: that only the consumer member code, and not the stored demographic data, protects anonymity of the user in Angles' system, and that a web page is customized based on the information contained in the consumer member code, i.e., the cookie.

Application No. 09/677,711  
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006

Amended claim 3 recites:

A system for delivering customized web pages to users, said system comprising:

a computer associated with a user; and

at least one content server that stores content for at least one web page, wherein said content server receives a request for a web page from the computer, wherein the request for a web page includes demographic information, wherein said demographic information comprises anonymous demographic data, wherein the content server customizes the content of the requested web page based on the anonymous demographic data, and wherein said content server delivers the customized web page to the computer associated with the user.

Angles does not teach or suggest a system that "customizes the content of the requested web page based on the anonymous demographic data." As noted above, the Examiner contends that the consumer member code in Angles' system is anonymous demographic data. In fact, the consumer member code is not anonymous data, since a user can be uniquely identified by it. As stated in Angles: "the consumer computer stores a member code which uniquely identifies each consumer" (column 6, lines 62-63, emphasis added). Furthermore, since the consumer member code is merely a unique code generated within Angles' system to identify the user and does not itself contain any of the user's demographic information, it does not contain the information required for customizing a web page based on a user's demographics. As stated in Angles: "The advertisement provider uses the consumer member code to identify the consumer's demographic profile and preferences. The advertisement provider then selects an appropriate advertisement based on the consumer's profile" (column 3, lines 56-60, emphasis added).

Thus, Angles' system uses non-anonymous demographic information, i.e., the consumer profile, and not the consumer member code, to select an advertisement.

Application No. 09/677,711  
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006

Therefore, even if, as the Examiner has asserted, Angles could be read to teach that the consumer member code is demographic data and provides anonymity, Angles' system still does not customize a web page based on anonymous demographic data.

Accordingly, Angles does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 3. Claim 3 is therefore believed to be allowable over Angles.

Amended claim 31 recites: "customizing a web page to be displayed on the requestor's computer based on the anonymous demographic information." For the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 3, Angles does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 31. Accordingly, independent claim 31 is believed to be allowable over Angles.

Amended claim 15 recites: "a demographic identifier on a computer associated with a user, wherein the demographic identifier identifies the demographic information." Angles does not teach or suggest a "demographic identifier that identifies the demographic information." As noted above, Angles' consumer member code identifies the user, not the demographic information. Accordingly, Angles does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 15. Claim 15 is therefore believed to be allowable over Angles.

Similarly, new claim 45 recites: "a demographic identifier that identifies the anonymous demographic data." For the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, Angles does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 45. Accordingly, independent claim 45 is believed to be allowable over Angles.

Dependent claims 19, 20, 32-33, 35-44 and 46-53 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 3, 15, 31 and 45, respectively.

Furthermore, with respect to new dependent claim 40, Angles does not store demographic information on a user computer. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that in Angles: "the cookie having the consumer member code and stored in the user computer is viewed as demographic information" (page 4).

Application No. 09/677,711  
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006

New dependent claim 40 recites:

The system of claim 3, wherein the demographic information is stored on the computer associated with the user.

Angles does not teach or suggest a system "wherein the demographic information is stored on the computer associated with the user." As noted above, the Examiner contends that the consumer member code is demographic information. In fact, the consumer member code is not demographic information; instead, it merely references demographic information that is stored in the registration database. As stated in Angles: "the advertisement provider computer 18 uses the consumer member code 22 to access the consumer's profile in the registration database 68" (column 18, lines 61-63). Furthermore, Angles clearly states that the consumer member code and the demographics data are distinct: "the registration module 60 stores the consumer member code 22 and the consumer's demographic data in the registration database 68" (column 17, lines 18-20, emphasis added). Thus, in Angles, the consumer member code is separate from the demographic data. Accordingly, Angles' system does not store demographic information on a user computer. Therefore, new dependent claim 40 is believed to be allowable over Angles.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's § 102(e) rejection of claims 3, 15, 19, 20, 31-33 and 35-36 are respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/677,711  
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 14 2006

*Conclusion*

In view of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome, and that the application, including claims 3, 15, 19, 20, 31-33, and 35-53, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

7/14/06

By:

Andrew W. Spicer

Andrew W. Spicer  
Registration No. 57,420  
Technology, Patents & Licensing, Inc.  
2003 South Easton Road, Suite 208  
Doylestown, PA 18901  
267-880-1720  
Customer No.: 27833

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**